<center>**REMARKS**</center>

SUMMARY OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-25 were pending in the application. Claims 6, 10-12, 17, 19-21 and 25 has been amended, the withdrawn claims 1-5 and claims 9 and 18 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and no new claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 6-8, 10-17, and 19-25 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

AMENDMENT TO THE SPECIFICATION

Applicants have amended the Abstract to address the issue noted in the office action. A replacement Abstract is appended at the end of this reply.

REJECTION UNDER SECTION 112

Applicants have amended the dependency of claim 25 to address the issue noted in the office action and submit that amended claim 25 is now in definite form and meets the requirements of section 112.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In the office action, claims 6-14, 16-23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,856,800 (hereafter "Henry"). Claims 15, 16, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Henry in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,069,587 to Ito (hereafter "Ito"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, retrieving, at <u>a control point in *the UPnP network*</u>, a <u>device description</u> associated with the UPnP device; invoking, at the control point, a first authentication process to authenticate the device with the control point; retrieving, at the control point, <u>a service description</u> associated with the device; and retrieving, at the control point, <u>a presentation page</u> associated with the device<u>, wherein the first authentication process comprises receiving a certificate from the device; and authenticating the device using the certificate; and sending a certificate from the control point to the device for the device to authenticate the control point.</u>

None of these recited features is disclosed or suggested by Henry for at least the following reasons.

First, Henry does <u>not relate to a UPnP network at all</u>. Accordingly, Henry does not disclose a control point in a UPnP network and nor does Henry disclose retrieving,

<center>Page 8 of 12</center>

at the control point, a <u>device description associated with a UPnP device</u>. Nor does Henry disclose retrieving at the control point either <u>a service description or a presentation page associated with a UPnP device</u>. Specifically, Henry relates to a fast authentication and access control for a mobile networking system in which a network access device is authenticated to an authentication server through an access point. Therefore, the access point of Henry (which the office action equates to the claimed UPnP control point) has no disclosure (and no need) for the claimed device description, the service description, or presentation page associated with a claimed UPnP device (which the office action equates with Henry's network access device. <u>Since these claimed features are completely missing from Henry's disclosure, Henry cannot anticipate independent claim 6</u>.

Second, independent claim 6 recites a two way <u>authentication process that includes receiving a certificate from the device, and authenticating the device using the certificate; and sending a certificate from the control point to the device for the device to authenticate the control point</u>. No such two-way authentication is disclosed or suggested (or even needed) by Henry since Henry's mobile network access device seeks authentication from an access point or from an authentication server. There is simply no disclosure (and no need) for the access point of Henry to authenticate itself to the mobile network access device. With respect to this feature in original claims 9 and 10, the office action cited to col. 3, line 61 to col. 4, line 30 of Henry. However, the cited portion of Henry only relates to Figure 3 in which the access point authenticates the network access device but there is no disclosure of the access point sending a certificate by which the network <u>access device *authenticates* the access point</u>. Therefore, this recited feature is also not disclosed by Henry. Accordingly, Henry cannot anticipate independent claim 6 for this additional reason.

Furthermore, the deficiencies of Henry are not cured by any of the other applied references. Specifically, Ito relates to a permission state for connections being timed out so that connection can only be made for a timed period to prevent unauthorized access and does not cure either of the two above-identified deficiencies of Henry. Therefore, independent claim 6 is patentable over the applied art.

Independent claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, transmitting a search request multicast from the <u>control point of an UPnP network</u> to a predetermined network address; receiving a response to the multicast from at least one device in the UPnP network,... retrieving, at the control point, <u>a device description associated with the UPnP device</u> retrieving, at the control point, <u>a service description associated with the device</u>; and retrieving, at the control point, <u>a presentation page associated with the device, *wherein the first authentication process comprises receiving a certificate from the device, and authenticating the device using the certificate, and sending a certificate from the control point to the device for the device to authenticate the control point*</u>. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 6, the features highlighted above are not disclosed by either Henry or Ito or their reasonable combination for the reasons discussed in the context of similar features recited in independent claim 6. Accordingly, independent claim 17 is also believed to be patentable over the disclosure of Henry and Ito.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are deemed to be patentable at least based on their dependence from allowable independent claims. In addition, they recite patentable subject matter when considered as a <u>whole</u>.

Specifically, claims 11-13 and 19-22 recite features in the process of the control point authenticating itself to the UPnP device. Likewise, claims 15-16 and 24-25 recite a second authentication process that transmits PIN/password <u>*from a control point* to a device</u>. None of the applied references disclose any of these features when considered as a whole. Accordingly, these recited features provide additional reasons for the patentability of these claims.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and an indication of the same is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

If this Amendment is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this Response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully Submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Dated: January 2, 2008
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052

By: /Aaron C. Chatterjee/
    Aaron C. Chatterjee
    Reg. No. 41,398
    (425) 706-7453